G R S 59] GPB—15 000—22 7 14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

1902

(Education)

File No. 21-02

Serial Nos. 1-6

~~Papers Filed.~~

Month June 1903

SUBJECT

Increment to Khadir Hussain Hindustani Munshi, Chennapatna High School

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES
Commenced L.S.Rao	Indexed K.Ranganathan

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE Edn

REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS

No 21 of 02-03

Short Office Note

No and date of letter from whom catch words to denote nature of Subject should be stated in red ink

One form may be used for more than one letter of the same file as long as there is space The Office Note should be in black ink Write only on side of this form

*Subject Pandits & Munshis

Requesting sanction to the grant of the next increment to Khader Hussain in class III of Pandits & Munshis viz (Rs 20 - 2/1 - 30)

Letter No 4876/165 d the 3rd oct 1902

Note

Khader Hussain was drawing a pay of Rs 25 a month, as Hindustani Assistant master Kolar Normal school

In January 1901 he was promoted by the Dy Dl of Education to class III of Pandits and Munshis (Rs 20 - 2 - 30), appointed as Hindustani Assistant Chamarajendra High school and he was allowed to draw a pay of Rs 26 a month in that class

The Dy Dl now reports that Khadir Hussain completed one years service in class III of Pandits & Munshis, has first increment of Rs 2 that class falls due from the 1st February 1902 and requests

requests sanction to the grant of
the increment that to Khader
Hussains pay with Rs 28 a month
with effect from the 1st February 1902
Submitted for orders &

NE
10/12/02

Subd to the order

It is not known why this
reference was not made
for six many months past
Further, the Insp-Genl
having placed the teacher
in Class III of Pundits and
Munshis - graded appointment -
it is not clear why he asks
for Govt sanction for a
promotion which is entirely
by the scale

HH 12/12/02

Ed 62
10.12.02

Please reply as follows
The object of this
communication
reference is not understood
Head Masters have no
objection to the increment
earned by this official
under standing orders being
given to him from due
date. The Educl attention would
be drawn to the delay in making
this reference

13/12/02

Delhi
7849
0025 + 11 02

Subd to the Divan
HH 16/12/02

Lahore Comr to Foy Secy
2 II 03 - 91 - Is this necessary as the

necessity for reference they
deserved would suit
(illegible)
2 II 03

Submitted to the Hd/Dr (illegible)
3/7/03

Ed 03
3-2-03

True, there was no necessity for
a reference; but when
the Head of a Dept thinks
that a reference is necessary
he ought to make it in
proper time. If any delay on
his part ought to be
pointed out to him. If
however the Dewan still
thinks that the Lost-
Revenue Steward be
excused, by all means
do so. (illegible)
8/2/03

To the Dewan
Sir
9/2

9943
Wordsworth
(illegible)
12 II 03

10/2
P2 9/9
10 2 03

Issue Sir
3/2

Draft submitted for approval

(illegible)
10/2/03

the above orders
were communicated
to the Dfl & Comptr Mysore fort
in 8 Pro no 12272-3 d 23-2-03)
d 308

In the reference to the 1st three sentence of the order (The object of the above reference — re the payment of the annual increment of Rs 2 in Class III of Pandits & Munshis from the 1st Feb 1902 to Khader Khan, Persian and Hindustani munshi of the Chennapatna High school — is not understood) the D Gl of Edn now reports that the reference was made for the purpose of obtaining exemption for Khader Khan from the operation of Art. 102 (a) of the Mysore service Regulations.

Submitted for orders to Secy

17/3/03

KCC
16/3/03

Send a d.o letter to the Comptr—

St 2a lays down that an Offr on therein described "will count time for increments as if he had commenced on the minimum pay Dear Mary I request you to let me know for the inf n of Govt how this clause will be interpreted (accordg to usage &c) in the following case

25—4

A — an officer on 26 Rs Subst Pay

to ... steered to a post of 20-2-30
on 1 Jan 1900! When is he to get
on attg to 28 Rs — is it on 1 Jan 1901 or
on 1st Jan 1904 Thus later will be the
date of it is held that he
shd be treated as if he had
started on the 1 Jan 19[illegible] on 20 Rs
only"

18/3/13

21/3/13

D.O drafted
VC
21/3/13

D.O reply of the Cor Controller
(in draft date) which was received
on the 16th is submitted

The Cor Controller refers ~~to~~ at
102 (c) of the service Regulations
and states that the officer referred
to in the above orders of the
Secy will get Rs 28 on the 1st
January 1904 (as if he had
commenced on the minimum pay)
under the appointment on
Rs 25 was in the same Deptt
and the pay and increments
which were identical.

A similar instance was cited by the Secy in ref the order in the case in particular

Khadir Hussain (the pfficial) in question was drawing a fixed pay of Rs 25 as Assistant Asst master Normal school Tholar

In January 1901 he was promoted to the Dfl of Edn to Class III of Pandits & Munshis (Rs 20-2-30) and he was appointed as Hindustan munshi Chennapatna High school and allowed to draw a pay of Rs 26 a month in that Class

The appointments which Khadir Hussain held are in the same (Edn) Deptt but they are not appointments of which the pay and increments are identical as contemplated in sect 102(a)

Orders are solicited as to whether Khadir Hussain should get his next increment of Rs 2- (ie a pay of Rs 28) with effect from the 1st Feb 1902 ~~or~~ or from the 1st Feb. ~~1903~~ 1905.

Joined appointn the 7th Jan 1901 = 20
1st Feb 1902 22
1st Feb 1903 24
1st Feb 1904 26
1st Feb 1905 28

Tel 21-4-03) Ht 102 (a) is clear and if there is a hardship, it is for Govt to amend the article instead of making an exception in this case

21/4/03

Lo.

The previous reply of Govt has committed us to the course of granting exemption in this case

The interpretation is somewhat surprising though it is probably correct

A draft sanctioning exemption is submitted I think it also deserves consideration whether the rule should not be altered.

22/4/53

The Govt
through the 2nd
Councillor —

Draft subd for approval

ZC
24-4-53

Ref 153
27-4-53
camp Ooty

Thakur Kripens filed
Nov near Rs 25 — In January he was put up the 3rd Cash Pandit — not ch it approached a Salary of Rs 20 — 2 — 30 — He was drawing Rs 26 — 2 —

was then that the sanction of Govt should have been obtained for the offence charged as a higher punishment than the minimum. This was not done - however that the case was dealt with on 9 January 07, the subsequent increments follow as a matter of course & no special sanction was required

I am afraid the Khalsa is labouring under a misapprehension. The correspondence bears out the fact that the offence in question was claimed in January 07 on Rs 6 & not on the minimum pay of Rs 20 It was to claim him on a higher pay than the minimum that sanction was required why the application was made & how it escaped notice in the Comptrollers office is not clear - To give a man Rs 28 at the end of a year from the date of his being given Rs 26 is not allowed by the article quoted & requires no special sanction

With C.S. Regns
(Service Regulations Punjab)
Ref 1-5-03

27/4/03

I think under S 102(a), the head the Dept^t is Competent to start the man on higher pay than the min^m without the sanction of Govt^t If (as appears probable) the Comptr^s interpretation is correct, & Mr Bhabha seems to be right also I would therefore venture to solicit reconsideration

The 2^nd Counsellor

3/5/03

Ed 167
7-5-03
Compatty

If so what can the Govt^t sanction for & why should the I G C solicit it? The increments are due as a matter of course & no orders of Govt^t are required — Q

11/5/03

The H^d of the Department may start him on higher Pay himself - e g as in this case on 26 Rs instead of on 20 Rs If the Comptr^s interpretation (which the I G apparently accepts) is upheld, he will get 28 Rs only on 1 Jan ~~1904~~ 1905 The I-C wishes to give it to him 3 years salaries

This as far as I understand explains the necessity for Govt intervention —

13/5/03

The 2nd Councillor

Ed 191 15-5-03 comp act

I/ the offl was initially started on Rs 26/ his further increments followed as a matter of course and I do not consider that any order of Govt was necessary. I still think that my order is all right

16/5/03

Corty 10326 18 5 03

1969

When the 2nd Councillor considers the effect of words that will count- ment for increments as I have pointed out on the memorandum they seem to be clear —

25 V 03

To the 2nd Councillor

Ed 605 20 5 03

29/5

I am thankful to the Dewan for pointing this out to me. I had unfortunately lost sight of it — The order proposed may be passed — 9/6/03

JD

11/1

Edn 81 J

(-1) 1 by no 6317 Ed 176

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF EDUCATION IN MYSORE

No 4876/165 Bangalore 3rd December 1902

From

H J BHABHA Esq
Inspector General of Education in Mysore

In A Eder
FILE No 21 of 02

To

H V Nanjundayya Esqre, B.A., B.L.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments

Sir,

SE No 65 (a) 7 & C & D F 8-96

I have the honour to inform you that in the arrangements sanctioned by me on receipt of Gr. No 4909-10 Ed 4, 27-96 dated the 4th October 1900 Khader Hassan who was in receipt of a fixed pay of Rs 25/- a month as Hindustani Assistant Master, Kolar Normal School was appointed on Rs 26/- a month as Persian and Hindustani Munshi Channapatna High School in class III of Pandits and Munshies i.e 20-2-30 throughout his service of about 17 years in the Education Department his work has been satisfactory. His present work as Hindustani Munshi of the Channapatna High School has been reported on favourably He deserves to get his next increment

in the class referred to above with effect from the 1st February 1902 as he joined his graded appointment on the 7th January 1901. Under these circumstances I request that Government may be pleased to sanction the payment of the next increment to Khadir Hussain from the 1st February 1902

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

H Bhabha
Inspector General

(2) 2 Draft for approval

Read —

Letter No 4876/165 d the 3rd December 1902, from the I Gl of Edn in Mysore, reporting that the arrangements ordered by him on receipt of G O No 4909-10 dated the 4th Oct 1900 Ed 7 2796 sanctioning the opening of two Moulvis' classes in the Normal school, Mysore, and the employment of two teachers for the purpose in classes II & III of Pandits and Munshis — one Khadir Hussain who was in receipt of Rs 25 as Hindustani Assistant master of the Normal school at Kolar was appointed on Rs 26 a month as Persian and Hindustani Munshi of the High school at Chennapatna in class III of Pandits and Munshis ie Rs 20 - 2/1 - 30, in the

SECTION Educn

FILE No 21 of 02

(2)

with effect from the 7th January 1901, and requesting sanction to the payment of Khadir Hussain's first increment of Rs 2 in his graded appointment from the 1st Feb 1902, his work throughout his service having been reported to be satisfactory

Order thereon No 12272-3
Ed 308
Dated 23rd Feb 1903

The object of the above reference is not understood. Govt however have no objection to the increment earned by ~~the~~ Khadir Hussain under standing orders being given to him from due date

17/2/03
By Secretary

2 Govt orders approved by the Dewan 16/2/03
KH

To The D of Ed, in Mysore
Comptroller, Mysore Govt

Ed 306

Edn 78] 1903 – 1903

From

H J BHABHA Esq,
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF EDUCATION
IN MYSORE.

To

SECTION

FILE No 21-L 02

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No 646
No 218

Enclosures

of the High school at Chamapatia, to be
the operation of Article 102(a) of the Navy
Service Regulations

H J Bhabha
Inspector General

LEB

Bangalore

21-3- 1903

My Dear Mr. Subrayan,

Section 102 of the Mysore Service Regulations lays down that an Officer therein described will count time for increments as if he had commenced on the minimum pay. May I request you to let me know for the information of Govt how this Clause will be interpreted (according to usage etc)in the following case

SECTION 6 (a)
FILE NO 21 of 4

A an Officer on Rs ~~26~~ 25 substantive pay is transferred to a post of Rs 20-2-30 on 1st Jan '00. When is he to get Rs 28-- Is it on 1st Jan 1901 or on 1st Jan '04? This latter would be the date if it is held that he should be treated as if he had started on 1st Jan 1900 on Rs 20 only

and allowed to draw Rs 26 in that grade from that date

Yours sincerely

21/3/03

To despatched 4 30 Pm 21-3-03

Secretary's order

Read at Court 7 Nov 1903 on 14/4/03

14/4/03

21/02

Hey dear Mr Chamberlain Sir Ras

In reply to your D.O. of 21st March re interpretation of Art 102 of the Imperial Service Regs please refer to Art 102.(a) under which the Rulers can transfer an appointment on 20-2-30 at pay of 2 Rs will count-time for

increment as if he
had commenced
on the minimum pay
The Officer referred to
in your D.O. will
get 28 R only on 1st
Jany 904 unless the appointment on 25th
was in Reserve Depot & the pay & increments of
Wh was in Training Duty of Full Accounts
was restored during Forty-Thirty D.O was lost sight

1900-1900

Read

Correspondence ending with D O letter (received on the 10th Inst) from the Comptroller to the Govt of Mysore

---

Order thereon No 17475-6 Dated 12th June 03 ED500

Edn

FILE No 21-02

6

The above correspondence relates to the question when Khadir Hussain Persian and Hindustani Munshi of the High School at Chennapatna should get his 1st increment in Class III of Pandits & Munshis (Rs 20-2/1-30) in which progressive appointment he was allowed by the I G of Edn to draw a pay of Rs 26 a month from the 7th January 1901 Before this date he was only drawing Rs 25 (fixed pay) as Asstt master of the Normal School at Kolar

2. The I.G. of Edn in his letter No 4870 /105 dated the 3rd December 02 reported that Khadir Hussain has, throughout his service, done satisfactory work and recommended that he may be granted the first increment in the new appointment i e his pay may be Rs 28 a month with effect from the 1st February 1902 The effect of this proposal is , as subsequently explained by the I G , in his Docket No 7040/202 dated the 28th February 1903 , to exempt Khadir Hus-

Hussain from the operation of Art.102 (a) of the Mysore Service Regulations according to which Khadir Hussain will, for the purposes of his increments in the new progressive appointment, count time as if he had commenced on the minimum pay, i.e he would be entitled to a pay of Rs 28, after ~~three~~ the expiry of 4 years i.e on the 7th January 1905.

3 Government are pleased to exempt, as a special case, Khadir Hussain from the operation of Section 102 (a) of the Mysore Service Regulations, and direct that he be granted the 1st increment in his new appointment (from Rs 24 to Rs 28) from the 1st February 1902 as recommended by the Inspector General of Education.

Secretary.

Draft
24-4-03

9/6/03

No

The Inspector General of Edn in Mysore.

" Comptroller to the Government ~~to the Government~~ of Mysore.